

THE REHEARSAL.

1. Clear'd from being against the Succession of the House of Hanover.
2. From Reflecting upon that Illustrious House.
3. From being the Author of that Distinction of High and Low Church.
4. The Weakness of the Rehearsal an Advantage, if Rightly taken.
5. As to what Church the Rehearsal is of.
6. The several Enemies of the Church. And the Danger She is in. This no Reflection upon the Queen.
7. The Argument of Mercury against any Danger in calling over the House of Hanover. That no Pretence of Weakness can be laid against the Queen, for any to Shoulder her.
8. Of Danger to the Succession, by the Absence of the Successor.
9. Of the Fear of a Common-Wealth in that Case.
10. Whether the Mercurius or the Rehearsal most against the Succession.

From Wednesday October the 31th to Wednesday November the 7th 1705

Since Engag'd I must be, Engag'd I am, tho' I think enough has been said upon this Subject. I am now put to Defend my self. And my Silence may be Construd as Guilt. Having to do now only with Mercurius, (and for variety) I have Dismiss'd my Countryman for this Time. And shall Address my self only to the Author of that Paper. Whom I never had the Happiness to see, tho' I have sometimes Desir'd it, because I heard a Good Character of him; and have Read some things said to be his, which were Wrote with Wit and Spirit. But Fear-say is a very uncertain Author: Therefore I have said nothing Personal against Mercurius, or so much as Pretended to Guess what his Principles were, either as to Church or State. Far less Objected them, upon Surmise, against him.

(1.) But Sir, I must complain that I have not had the same Treatment from you. Particularly in your Mercurius of last Octob. 27th No. 40. Wherein you Turn the Argument we were upon, all into Objections against my self. And offer to give Innuendoes of my Private Thoughts. And Improve that so far as to say, If there were no Manifest Reasons for the Necessity of Calling over the Princes of HANOVER, his Writing against it, however Weakly, wou'd be no mean one, if we believe any Considerable Party to be of his Opinion. For we think 'tis Pretty Apparent, that there are more Manifest Indications of some Peoples intentions to Oppose the Succession of the House of HANOVER, than of any others to Advance 'em before their time. For even this Author can't Deny, but that he do's not wish their Succession, and were it in his Power, that he wou'd Prevent it.

This is a Heavy Charge. And no less than Treason, as it is here set down, to Oppose the Succession of the House of Hanover. But Sir, I will Appeal to your self, and to your own Words but 5 Lines after those above Quoted, which are these, Justice as well as Charity obliges us not to Charge men with Opinions, which they have not subscribed to, or Openly Maintain'd.

But Sir, I'll go further with you. I have Openly Maintain'd, in the very Papers you Answer, That I am far from Presuming to Limit Providence as to the Succession of the House of Hanover. And that we ought Cheerfully and Conscientiously to Obey them, whenever they come to the Crown, according to the Laws of God, and of England. This is our Duty. But so far as is left us to Wish, that I wou'd rather desire the Queen had Issue of her own. And do not you wish the same?

Now Sr, I call upon your Justice and Charity, not to make me a Transgressor, for Openly Maintaining the same thing that you do. Or shew me, that I have Openly Maintain'd any thing Else.

(2.) There is Another thing, Sir, wherein I must say you have greatly Wrong'd me. And that is, in Charging me with making Reflections against the Illustrious House of Hanover, as if they were Concern'd in this Design, of having Themselves call'd over. Whereas I expressly said the Contrary. And that I did no ways Suppose it. If you Sir, have better Intelligence (for I have none) from that Court, you may tell it, as you think fit. But I am sure, nothing I have said can lay the Least of that Reflection upon ME.

(3.) But Sr, how will you forgive your self for Charging upon me that Distinction of High and Low Church! Whereas you cannot but know, that in all I have wrote, I have Constantly declar'd my Abhorrence of that Distinction, and said, That it was set up by the Whiggs and Dissenters on Purpose to have a Handle, under the Name of High Church, to Blacken the Whole Church, her Principles, Disciplin, Lyturgie, and whole Constitution. As is Apparent in all their Arguments and Invektives against what they call the High Church.

Did I then Adopt that Factious Distinction? As you say, p. 158. If by Adopting you mean Using it, you do so too, in speaking against it. And shew that I ever Us'd it Otherwise. It is now become the Language of the Nation. And a Man wou'd not be understood, if he did not Use it. Both Whiggs and Dissenters take to Themselves the Name of the Church of England. And even as by Law Established! For the Dissenters have, in Print, Vindicated their Toleration to be an Establishment. And as good a Legal Establishment as the Church has. And that they are more the Church of England in Principles too, and according to our 39 Articles, than the present Bishops and Clergy, who call themselves the Church of England! Therefore if a Man wou'd speak Intelligibly, and to avoid Cavil, he must use these Distinctions, since they are set up, to let Men know plainly what he means. But is this Adopting these Distinctions, which at the same time he Blames? Is this, Sir, (what you further Charge me with, p. 159.) to CREATE new Divisions and Political Schisms by INTRODUCING Terms of Enmity and Opposition amongst Us? Is this My Unseasonably Impolitic Division of the Church into High and Low? Am not I hear very unjustly Charg'd, contrary Sir, to your own Knowledge and Conscience? And there I leave it.

(4.) Only let me tell you, that there was no need of your going out of your way, to reach such Blows at me, since you say the Rehearsal's Opposing this Design of bringing over the Heirs of Hanover (however WEAKLY) is an Argument for it. Therefore Sir, under favour you shou'd rather have Thank'd him, and let him go on, since one way you know of Opposing a thing is writing very Weakly for it. And some Politicians

rians have taken this Way. So that for ought you know, you and I may be upon the same Design! And you Mistook your Friend, who offer'd you an Advantage. Which you shou'd have taken by Exposing his Arguments to the full, without meddling with his Person; which is a Prejudice to most Readers, against the Force of Reason might otherwise Appear. Because that Method has been so often us'd by those who had nothing else left to say.

However Sir, I thank you for the Opportunity you have given me of Vindicating my self in the several Particulars you have laid to my Charge; and that you have made it so very Easie to me.

(5.) And I must not forgot one Especially, in your p. 158. If (say you) the Rebearser has any other Church than that which the Rubrick and Canons appoint and Establish, he do's us a Favour to Distinguish it. I profess, Sir, I know not where I ever did you that Favour! When did I Distinguish my self from that Church which the Rubrick and Canons appoint? I'm sure I never had any other Church. And I hope never shall. Unless she be taken from us. I am Resolv'd with the Grace of God, to keep Close to her, while one Rag of her is left together. And now I'll tell you freely, Sir, if I have any Scruples concerning the Church of England, it is, that she may Leave me, and not I her. That is, that she may Die before me. Which God of his Infinite Mercy Prevent.

(6.) Having said this, I must Obviate an Objection now usually made, as if this were any ImPLY'd Reflection upon her Majesties Affection to the Church of England. Why? Can no Evil come to the Church but from the Queen? I wish that were the Case! Do neither Popish nor Protestant RECUSANTS intend any Harm to our Church? Do Atheists, Deists, Socinians, and Whiggs (which are the two former, and not so Good as the Last) wish well to the Church of England? Is not the Church Militant, while she is upon Earth? Has she then no Enemies? Has she not the Devil, the World, and the Flesh, and their Prodd; continually to Struggle with? And have not many (otherwise) Good Churches had their Candlestick Remov'd, for not keeping Diligent Watch and Ward against These? Is not the Churches whole State a Warfare? Can she then ever say, she is not in Danger? And we Wrestle not only against Flesh and Blood, but against Principalities and Powers, and Wicked Spirits in High Places. Whereupon we are Commanded to Put on the whole Armour of God, that we may be able to Withstand in the Evil Day, and having done all, to Stand. Are we then in no Danger? Must we go to Bed and Sleep, while our Enemy like a Roaring Lion Traverses about, seeing whom he may Devour! And must this be Constru'd any Reflection upon the Queen! Sure they that think so, make the Reflection.

It is impossible for any Man to Doubt of the Queen's sincere and Ardent Affection to that Church wherein She Receiv'd her Christianity, and wherein she Hopes to be Sav'd. She never knew any other Church, and therefore no other Church can have her Affection.

We are not afraid OF her, but FOR her. That if the Churches Enemies and Hers shou'd gain the Ascendent, they may Ruin both the Church and Her; as they did in the Reign of her Royal Grand-Father. Of whose Affection to the Church no Man can Doubt. And I pray God she may never be brought to give that Testimony of it which he did, by Sealing it with his Blood. The same Principles, and the same Pretences which Strook that Fatal Stroke, are still Alive, and as Rampant as Ever. As even on that same

Black 30th. of January! Can any then forbid our Fears, our Concern, our Love for the Queen. And for the Church with her! It is the only thing wherein the Queen herself (if she shou'd so Command) cou'd not be Obey'd by us, while we Retain any Concern, Duty, and Affection to the Church, and to her Majesty! These Passions are in no Human Government. We cannot but See! And we cannot but Fear! And our Silence wou'd be Guilty!

(7.) How much more, when we see the Queen Attack'd, and a Successor thrust upon her, whether she will or not! You mention some of our English Kings who were Dispossest by their Remote Successors, on Pretence of their Weakness on several occasions. Then you come in, p. 160, and say, But which of these Occasions can be found about the Queen; That any of the House of Hanover should be able to shoulder her from the Throne? Did you not Smile, when you wrote this? Were ever Pretences wanting, by Factioned Spirits, against the Best and Wisest of Princes? Against Moses, and David, and Solomon, and the Royal Martyr, Grand-Father to our Queen? And is not this the very Reason you give for Calling over the Princess of Hanover, to take care of the Government, in your Mercur. Num. 35. of which I told you in mine, Num. 67. And shew'd you I think Plainly, That it was all Bottom'd on a suppos'd Weakness in the Queen! And you suppose her Weak indeed, if you think she fees not this!

(8.) You next mention some who were Hurt in their Absence at the time, when those that set up against them were upon the spot. And you mention the Case of Stephen and the Empress Maund. But Sir, even in that Case, you know very well, That when Henry II. the Son of Maund, had for the Peace and Quiet of the Nation, made a Compromise with Stephen, to let him keep the Crown during his Life, he did Keep it accordingly, and Dy'd in his Bed, in Possession of the Crown; tho' Hen. 2. was in the Kingdom. Now tho' a Case be Bad, yet let us not make it Worse than it is!

(9.) But in the same p. 160. you give up this Topick, as not concerning our Present Case, as indeed it do's not, there being now none in the Kingdom to Dispute the Succession of the House of Hanover. Then you go to the fear of a Common wealth. But Sir, is a Common Wealth a thing can be Form'd in a Moment? Upon the Demise of any of our Kings, the Successor is Proclaim'd the same Day, which makes our Law say, that the King never Dyes. And can a Common Wealth be Lickt into Shape so soon, as to step in between?

No. But you say, the Common-Wealth-Party may Joyn with the Party of any Pretender. What! When there is none in the Kingdom? Then they may do it NOW, as well as THEN. And if the Government of the Queen be so Weak as you Suppose it, they may Hope to Succeed better NOW, than THEN.

(10.) Upon the whole, Sir, whether do they most oppose the Succession of Hanover, who wou'd have things lie Still and Quiet, and the Queen to Govern, without Disturbance, during her Life; Or those who set up that Succession against her, in her own Time? Which of these do Tempt her Majesty to wish that Succession Broken? They who wou'd let her be Easie with it? Or they who shew, That she cannot Enjoy one Quiet Hour, while it Lasts? Which of these Consult most the Queen's safety and Consequently of Church and Kingdom; or Prejudice the Lovers of all these most against the Succession?